

New York Tribune.

First to Last—The Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

SUNDAY, JULY 25, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, 150 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, July 16, 1879, under post office No. 150, New York, N. Y. Postage paid at New York, N. Y. and at additional mailing offices.

Subscription Rates: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York. Daily, 10¢; Sunday, 5¢. In Advance, 3 months, \$2.50; 6 months, \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00. Single Copies, 5¢. Foreign Rates: Daily, 15¢; Sunday, 10¢. In Advance, 3 months, \$7.50; 6 months, \$13.50; 1 year, \$24.00. Single Copies, 10¢. Canadian Rates: Daily, 12¢; Sunday, 8¢. In Advance, 3 months, \$3.50; 6 months, \$6.50; 1 year, \$11.00. Single Copies, 8¢.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 16, 1879, under post office No. 150, New York, N. Y. Postage paid at New York, N. Y. and at additional mailing offices.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in the TRIBUNE with absolute safety—THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

For the National Defence.

Mayor Mitchel is not a military critic, a militarist, a soldier by training or a statesman with jingoistic proclivities. He spoke only as a good citizen when at Fish-kill camp the other day he attacked the delusions, the inertia, the stupor at Washington and in the public mind which have left the country unprepared to enforce just demands which it is compelled to make in international crises to protect its citizens who travel on the high seas or even to defend its own territory.

The Mayor did not need any great expert knowledge to justify his assertion that "this nation would be incapable of defending its heritage if attacked to-day by any first class power," for, as he justly said, "that fact is incontrovertible and is admitted by all those who know our actual condition and have the courage to speak the truth upon this question." The truth is there if any one cares to look for it and face it. But the saddest aspect of the situation has been the unwillingness of the public and of legislators and administrators to surrender to empty but highly popular American superstitions—the one that war can be made impossible by devices like arbitration, and the other that our geographical isolation protects us to such an extent that we can afford to dispense with a real army and to maintain only a moderately developed navy.

Since August 1, 1914, it has been clear that international agreements and the machinery of arbitration cannot protect any nation unable to protect itself. Belgium's fate settled that. Moreover, the vast scope and scientific efficiency of modern war have practically annihilated distance and stripped us of our fancied immunity through isolation. If armies can be carried from Australasia, New Zealand and Canada to the Dardanelles, they can easily be transported from Europe to the United States. That is now only a matter of capable staff organization.

Nevertheless, since August 1, 1914, we have stood pat on our pitiful condition of military unpreparedness. At its last session Congress authorized increases in the naval establishment which merely carried out an existing programme and which even fell short of the modest recommendations of the General Board of the Navy. Nothing whatever was done to reorganize and strengthen the army, in spite of the incisive report of Secretary Garrison exposing its manifold and glaring deficiencies.

The country is fortunate in having at the head of the War Department a man who has rid himself of the misinformation, the cant and the cheap phrases which have so long befogged the public. He sees that our army is a shell, a skeleton, the mere shadow of what a national army ought to be. He has ceased to think of our military situation in terms of the long distant frontiersman's era. He knows that if we have a serious occasion to use the army it will be short in everything—in officers, men, rifles, artillery, ammunition, transport and commissary, in all the subsidiary corps and in aeroplane service. It will have no adequate first line and no trained reserve of any sort to draw upon.

Mr. Garrison has worked earnestly and intelligently to strengthen the army. But he has had little support either in Congress or from the administration of which he is a part. How indifferent the administration as a whole has been to military needs is shown by the fact that when an association of citizens undertook to enroll and train volunteers who might form a reserve for the army the government took pains to show that such a patriotic movement lacked official sanction.

At last, however, we hear from Washington that plans for diminishing our military unpreparedness are to receive attention from the President. The task which should have been accomplished last fall is going to be approached next fall. It is even hinted that the extra session of Congress which The Tribune has urged "or purposes of preparation may soon be called.

The sooner it is called the better. No nation can afford to exhibit its pitiable military weakness to the world at a time when it is particularly exposed to friction with foreign nations and is trying to maintain rights which are challenged by both the belligerent combinations in Europe. To preserve our own self-respect as well as to enforce respect on others we must develop our military resources. We can do much more for our own rights and interests, for the peace of the world and

for the maintenance of international law as a strong man armed than we can as an argumentative champion whose ability to back up words with deeds is universally discounted.

Chicago's Horror.

The Eastland catastrophe promises to transcend in its hideous cost of life our own Slocum disaster. Revised estimates of the dead reach 2,000. The victims of the General Slocum numbered slightly over 1,000. Even the Titanic dead reached a total of only 1,500, and the Titanic sank in midocean.

The Eastland turned over beside her pier in the narrow Chicago River. Words having failed to express a small part of the horror of this disaster, fall equally to encompass its incomprehensibility. That so many could be drowned within arm's reach of the shore in a crowded city canal is simply another revelation that the most gigantic death traps may be those most completely concealed. The General Slocum, burning to the water's edge in the middle of the East River, seemed an unbelievable happening. What, then, can be said of this?

As to the cause, the most reasonable explanation so far advanced is that which ascribes to the excursion boat an excess of superstructure. From Port Huron, Mich., where she was built in 1903, comes the significant statement that changes to accommodate more passengers were made in her after her completion. From Cleveland, her former home port, comes the added information that on one occasion, some years ago, when she was approaching her pier she listed to such a degree that she just escaped overturning, and condemnation proceedings were threatened or instituted. The charge that the life rafts and other equipment required by the new seamen's law were responsible for her lack of equilibrium appears true only in so far as they may have constituted a last straw in the burden she was never built to carry.

Have we any such boats in New York waters?

"Easily Explained."

Plausible hypotheses have been advanced to account for the unfortunate accidents that have lately befallen various vessels of our navy. The two fires on board the New York, the fire in the New Jersey and the Alabama, the fire in the Oklahoma, now approaching completion at the yards of the New York Shipbuilding Company; the fire in the collier Vulcan, the fire that threatened the destroyer Warrington and the mishap that nearly accomplished the sinking of another destroyer, the Ericsson—all these regrettable incidents are provisionally attributed to human fallibility of one kind or another, but the theory of sabotage at the instance of foreign agents is dismissed as altogether groundless and untenable.

It is no wonder, considering the number of accidents reported within a few days, that the public, in spite of official assurances to the contrary, was inclined to attribute them to malice, and though there is apparently no just reason for this suspicion, it cannot be said that the explanations now offered are by any means reassuring.

The case of the Ericsson, we are told, is "easily explained." The explanation is that a seaman, after washing down the decks, on Tuesday, failed "to turn off a water tap." He apparently forgot to do so—that is all—and no one noticed his little oversight till the following day. The fires we have heard of lately are said for the most part to have been "almost unavoidable." One of those in the New York may have been due to an incandescent lamp; the other may have been due to a lighted cigarette thrown carelessly in the midst of some inflammable stuff.

The official guesses at the causes in all cases are more or less similar. One fire was probably caused by dropping a lighted match in the wrong place, another was very likely due to the defective insulation of some wires—in short, carelessness, negligence or a want of discipline is quite sufficient to account for any of the various accidents. It is comforting to be assured that there is no reason to suspect a plot, but the explanations offered suggest some very mortifying reflections.

History and the Fashions.

Several years ago, when we were younger and took a more vivid interest in such matters, our tailor informed us, in answer to our inquiry, that gray had become the fashionable color for men's dress in consequence of England's mourning for Queen Victoria. Only a few years later this same authority predicted a change to navy blue on the occasion of the accession to the throne of George V, the sailor prince. Investigating, in the richer field of feminine apparel, this historic explanation of the seemingly arbitrary changes of the fashions, we learned that Paris invented the bustle to express the nation's indignation at England's entry into Egypt and its resentment of its own government's refusal to share in the adventure. The bustle, according to this somewhat fantastic story, was meant "sarkastikal," as a parody of the ungainly can on which Wolsey's soldiers rode into the desert. Be that as it may, certain it is that the Franco-Russian rapprochement, the famous visit of the French President to Cronstadt, suggested to Paris the vogue of the graceful Russian blouse. We know that one of the most curious stories of the Third Empire is connected with the introduction of the crinoline, whose return hung over us as a threat last year; and we may remember that now obsolete color, with its greswome suggestion of carnage, magenta red, in celebration of one of Louis Napoleon's costly victories. Khaki we got from the Spanish War, and, again staying patriotically at home for our fashions, we soon afterward introduced Alice blue.

Thus we return to our starting point, the connection between colors in dress and history. This time it seems to be a case of necessity, which promises to be symbolic, none the less: a lack of dyes that will drive us to what the fashion journals describe as "coffee color." It is, we understand, the one dye most readily at hand in this country to-day. Let some future deliver into the mysteries of past fashions astray and mistake the introduction of this color in 1915 (if it is really introduced) for a tribute to the valor of England's Indian troops, the true cause is set down here once for all. Men and women both, we may have to wear in the near future coffee-colored, snuff-colored, nud-colored clothes, browns of all hues, even the most uncertain ones, for we know that coffee is an elastic term, especially abroad. "It looks like rain," said the English hostess to her American guest, handing him his matutinal cup. "Yes," was the resigned reply, "but anyhow it smells somewhat like coffee." Café noir, mazarin, café-au-lait—the nomenclature is all ready, in the only language of fashion, even when the product is purely native. Thus will history once more decide what we shall wear, though in a curiously roundabout way. And if our dyes should decide to revive for the designation of one of these sober brown hues the archaic adjective "sad-colored," the appropriateness of the new fashion will be proved beyond question or doubt.

Prizefighting for Suffrage.

Suffragists have penetrated to the ring-side and neither they nor the fight fans have recoiled shuddering from the contact. Mrs. Francis Brewer, who spoke for the cause between bouts at the St. Nicholas rink, said she could see "nothing objectionable" in the prizefights she witnessed, and she treated with the greatest good nature the tempest of free speech and tobacco smoke which muffled her periods. "Jimmie" Johnston, the fight promoter, announced that he would give the suffragists more chances to speak at his fights; and even Norman Hapgood and "Joe" Humphries parted with expressions of mutual regard.

Can there be in this the germ of an attitude of no little future significance to the race? Hitherto it has seemed as if fight fans and suffragists represented two reciprocally intolerant extremes in the community, masculinity brutally triumphant as against feminism. But when they are introduced to each other, as in this case, they apparently find enough in common to want to know each other better. The fighter for suffrage and the independence of her sex can appreciate man's joy in combat, and the man who honestly enjoys a scrap can enter into the woman's desire for a weapon which will help to safeguard her individuality.

All of which has a bearing on the question, Will universal suffrage breed pacifists and mollycoddlers? Not if prizefights become popular with suffragists and suffragists with the ringside fraternity.

Vatican Watches Wilson.—Headline. Watchful waiting?

What will Admiral Fiske's flying torpedo boat we shall be having home marines soon.

LOCUST PLAGUE IN EGYPT.

Better Method of Dealing with Them Now than 2,000 Years Ago.

(From The Dundee Advertiser.) The report of a locust plague in Egypt makes another addition to the "minor horrors" of war, as Dr. A. E. Shipley styles them. The Bible accounts are rather misleading, since they describe the locust fight only. This does little damage. The full grown insect has a small appetite and changes his base of operations rapidly. The really destructive creature is the larva, similar to the maggot, but black and unable to fly. A Red Sea swarm twenty-five years ago was estimated as occupying 2,000 square miles, and its weight was reckoned at 42,000,000 tons, which is hard to credit. The black larva march like an army. The Boers speak of their "march" and call them "voetgangers." They devour everything they meet, even the bark of trees and curtains and clothes in the houses, strip the wool of sheep, and, when other food fails, devour each other.

One naturally wonders what preventive methods the Egyptians are taking. Locusts were never successfully dealt with till 1881 in Cyprus, previously devastated from time immemorial by them. Matthei exterminated them, and since then they have done little harm to the island. His method was to erect a wall of leather around the advancing horde with a trap trench in front. Unable to climb the leather, they were caught in the trench.

Ways of Petrograd Police.

(From The Dundee Advertiser.) Count Benckendorff, the Russian Ambassador, who is in mourning for the loss of his son, Count Peter, killed in action, had among his predecessors in the title one who told a curious story of the thoroughness of the Petrograd police in the early nineteenth century. He had lost his pocketbook, containing a considerable sum, gave notice and had the money restored to him within a day or two, without the pocketbook. Shortly after he found that the pocketbook, still containing the original notes, was not lost, but had slipped into the lining of his fur coat. Naturally, he asked whence had come the restored money. He discovered that the police, rather than admit failure, had collected the money among themselves.

Cemetery Parasites.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: May I ask your aid in ventilating a grievance from which apparently hundreds of persons suffer, and suffer without knowing specifically how to protest against and so remedy the evil?

In a word, the neglect of endless graves for the care of which specified amounts are annually paid to dishonest and shameless persons, licensed by the cemetery corporations (it would seem) to prey upon the helpless living and dishonor the sacred dead.

The writer has just written to the corporation controlling (?) one of the best known cemeteries requesting a prompt cancellation of the permits under which these unscrupulous persons operate; i. e., in the acceptance of contracts which are utterly disregarded unless a sharp vigilance is maintained by those who annually pay said contracts. The matter comes too close to the numbers already saddened folk involved to justify silence on the subject.

A. J. F. New York, July 19, 1915.

THE NATION'S OPPORTUNITY

To Resist Temptation and Strike for the Right.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Germany's reply to President Wilson's note faces us with the great temptation. Satan has led us to the top of the mountain and is offering us the power and the glory if we will but serve him. What shall be our answer?

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide, In the Strife of Truth with Falsehood, for the good or evil shall be done. Some great truth, God's new Messiah offering each the bloom or blight, Parted the goats upon the left hand, and the sheep upon the right; And the choice goes by forever, 'twixt that darkness and that light."

We failed to take notice of the terrible atrocities committed in Belgium; we said not a word by way of protest against the use of asphyxiating gases and burning liquids, and we allowed the world to think that the barbarities practised in this war concerned us not at all. We acted thus, seemingly, because these matters were not in the bond. Well, we are now confronted with a more personal matter. The opportunity is given us to declare ourselves in deed as well as in word for the bloom and the light.

We dare not miss this opportunity. For up to now we have, of set purpose, removed ourselves from the divinely cleansing fires of this war, leaving it to individuals to purify themselves in the natural springs of their charity. But the nation as a whole is still unprepared, and this weary length of diplomatic correspondence, with its pitiable excuses, its evasive arguments and its degraded pleas about the "necessities of war," threatens to sterilize our native enthusiasm. As I go to business every morning I see people scanning the "war news" with a mild interest or with a slighting comment on the slowness of events. "Another yard gained," they say with a shrug of the shoulders, and proceed to shuffle the cards for the next rubber. We seem to be a little tired of the performance staged for us, as it were, in the gladiatorial amphitheatres of Europe. It is time we girded up our loins and made ready to enter the arena ourselves. It is time for our souls' sake.

For not only is our honor as a nation at stake, but the souls of our people are in danger of damnation. Is our neutrality to mean utter silence at the continual devastation of civilization that is going on in Europe? Is it to mean self-complicity in that we are not sufferers in the ruin of empires? Is our nationality to mean only our private safety, our private comfort, our private prosperity and our private peace? Has the United States no interest in mankind other than a business interest? Once it staked its very existence for a high ideal. It came out of that great struggle, fifty years ago, a nation so much the more finely tempered in spirit than when it entered it that it stands now, as it stood on the occasion of its memorable founding, rooted in those principles of humanity which make for enlightenment and the rights of man in wider commonality combined. Now that those principles and rights have been ignored and trampled under foot, are we to stand aside with smiling indifference? Is it possible for any true hearted American to remain unmoved at this tragedy of a second Crucifixion that is being enacted before his very eyes? I cannot believe it. I cannot believe that we are so utterly dead to all the impulses that make for clean hearts and brave souls.

What virtue there was in our neutrality is now gone out of it. The vampire in Germany has, in this its latest reply to us, sucked the last drop of its life blood and there is now nothing left of it but the pale corpse of its legal form.

We need not be afraid of the outcome of our entry into this struggle. We shall be for the right and against might—and the fates are always kind to the daring lover. And our action will, I feel sure, hasten the coming of the peace for which the whole world is now waiting in an agony of expectation.

RETRO ME SATHANA.

New York, July 22, 1915.

Unnecessary Din.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The infernal noises made by the hucksters throughout this section of the city, and no doubt through all other sections, are most nerve racking and certainly not conducive to the good health of the residents and taxpayers.

It starts at 3 a. m. with the milkmen and their wagons, yelling at their horses and juggling with their bottles and ice; then come the baker boys with their shrill whistles to drive away canine while on their route, after which the garbage men with their "Whoa!" "Gid up," "What'da me matter wid you?" etc., to their horses, succeeded by the scissors grinders, with their horns tooting; the rag men with their tingling bells, the vegetable men with their excruciating and unintelligible yelling, followed in quick succession by the berry men for afternoon tea, the canvassers for books, magazines, cards, wireless, sewing machines, babies' funds (many of the latter fakers), and even gypsy fortune tellers, followed in turn by the mud-gutter bands for afternoon concerts, and, to top it all off, the heart-rending scrapers of the street cleaners on the asphalt pavements; in other words, a constant racket from 3 a. m. to 7 p. m. Add to this the children playing (more so now, owing to the vacation season, but to which we have no objection), the man who is trying to get the nervous system more especially where night work is, including newspaper, telegraph, postoffice, railroad and men in various other occupations, have to sleep in the daytime are located, not forgetting the sick.

The Board of Aldermen, Health, Police and Street Cleaning departments should devise some means of minimizing these conditions, thereby relieving the long-suffering public, and I take the liberty of asking your assistance in this respect. PAUL H. FREYER. Brooklyn, July 19, 1915.

The Next Republican Convention.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Will you please inform me when and where the National Republican Convention will be held to nominate a candidate for President of the United States and how the delegates of that convention will be chosen?

D. B. S. Paterson, N. J., July 19, 1915. [The Republican National Committee will convene next December to choose a place for the meeting of the next Republican National Convention. It will also issue a call regulating the choice of delegates in accordance with the revised plan of representation adopted in December, 1913, by the committee and subsequently approved by states casting a majority of votes in the Electoral College.—E.]

Scripts.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Bully for you! L. B. FAIRFIELD. Bristol, Conn., July 20, 1915

AMERICA'S CASE AGAINST GERMAN SEA WARFARE.

In What Respects It Rests on the Law of Nations and in What Respects It Is Held to Transcend and Extend That Law.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Having followed your editorials since the receipt at Washington of the last German note, I am constrained once more to address you upon the subject of the relations between Germany and the United States. It is difficult to treat so large a subject in the proper compass of a letter, and I will therefore endeavor to confine myself to statements of fact and of law, and avoid discussion as far as possible.

There is a rule, older and of higher authority than legislatures and courts, that "self-preservation is the first law of nature." This maxim is just as true of nations as it is of individuals. Under the common law and statute law of the State of New York and of the United States, a man may kill in the preservation of his life or property, and the act, which otherwise would be murder, is justified.

England sowed mines in the North Sea and attempted to extend the list of contraband far beyond what has ever been considered to be legitimate under the rules of international law.

Germany began her naval warfare with submarines. England declared a paper blockade of Germany's ports and practically attempted a blockade of the neutral ports of all countries which bounded Germany, and extended her contraband declaration to all foodstuffs intended for Germany.

Germany began destroying merchant vessels loaded with supplies for England which England had declared to be contraband of war, including foodstuffs.

England instructed the captains of her merchant vessels to ram and fire upon submarines whenever possible; and offered large money prizes to the captains of vessels in her merchant marine who were successful in these operations. British newspapers have published the statement that such prizes have been paid.

Prior to Great Britain's prize offer to the captains of her merchant vessels German submarines had appeared above the surface and given opportunity to passengers and crews to escape; subsequent to this declaration and after one or more of Germany's submarines had been destroyed by merchant vessels Germany began destroying vessels without previous warning.

Germany gave notice that she considered herself justified in the destruction of any vessel of her enemies carrying contraband of war.

The above statements are, as I understand it, admitted on all sides to be facts. In sinking the Lusitania Germany simply carried her prior notice to a logical conclusion. In attacking the Orduna she did the same thing.

Had Germany submitted to England's pretended blockade, her food supply and perhaps her munitions of war would have been greatly curtailed and she correspondingly crippled. It is not beyond the possibilities that such measures, had they been successful,

HORSES REPAY KINDNESS

Work Better for Proper Food and Care.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I enjoy riding about the country. Perhaps the habit of observation for many years has made me very keen sighted in my old age, mentally.

Yesterday I had a delightful drive; of course, all the farming I observed was not equally good, but I saw nothing to sadden me until I came upon three horses, all worked by the same man. These horses had good frames, but the frames were too conspicuous; they had a worried, weary look and they certainly were not happy, as all animals have a right to be.

My heart ached for them. Several years ago I wrote an article for The Tribune Farmer, "A Tale of Two Horses," which was entirely true, for the horses were my own; who never lost a day's work in twenty years except a few days when her two colts were foaled by the mare of the farm. Not a forkful of musty hay or a measure of musty oats or an ear of mouldy corn ever went to their feeding; they were properly watered and groomed, and not hurried or hurried.

I wish to say that no matter how carefully the horses are fed if they are hurried from the time the harness is put on until it is taken off they will not look well, and they are not well. Worrying, fretting and hurrying them gives them indigestion; jerking and pulling their mouths makes them sore and they can not chew their food properly.

Kindness pays in the care of all animals. I do not believe there ever was a domestic animal which was treated kindly from its birth that became vicious.

I well remember my father coming into possession of a fine, well-bred horse which his owner never had parted with but he became so vicious through the treatment he received that he was no longer dared to keep him. This horse was six years old when my father bought him, a fine roan and very intelligent; he came to know Sunday from the other days of the week, as for many years we drove him to church, and he would of his own accord take the road leading to the church on Sunday, while on week-days when driven to the village he would take the road leading to the business part of the town. For many years he was the family horse and the saddle horse of the daughter of the family and proved himself a most loyal friend.

AN OLD FARMER. Ionia, N. Y., July 19, 1915.

A Schoolboy's Criticism.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Your editorial page is, to me at least, the most interesting part of your paper. I have been reading it for seven months, and my impression is that you claim it stands for "strict neutrality."

Perhaps it is best to say in the beginning that I am a true American, though away back my ancestors were German. I know this makes me a barbarian, murderer, pirate and even a maniac, especially if I attempt to champion the cause of Germany. Nevertheless, I charge you of being unneutral, unjust and disloyal to the American standards which you claim to uphold.

Not long ago you printed an editorial "On Battle Day." On July 17 you printed a letter asking for a similar editorial for Italy. This, I suppose, you will do next, or will it be one for England or Russia? But the public may rest assured that it will not be for barbaric Germany. Yet, who has the greatest economic and industrial system of today, who has turned out most of the world's greatest scientists, musicians and manufacturers? But, you claim, "it is not this to which we object. It is 'militarism.'" How, then, would Germany be worse if it were for her army? Do you suppose that England would allow Germany to advance so far as to become a rival of "Her Imperial Britannicity"? It has been so since the world began; for did not Rome destroy Carthage in 246

ful, would have destroyed Germany by placing her at a disadvantage against her enemies.

Until the history of the present war is written no one will know how necessary to Germany's survival is the obstruction, and, if possible, destruction of British commerce. It is therefore unsafe and unsound for any individual or newspaper to assume to say that the sinking of the Lusitania was improper; the same may be said of the acts of England which are contrary to the heretofore accepted rules of international law. The well established principle which permits a nation at war to do an act contrary to international law when her necessities require it to be done logically follows the maxim that self-preservation is the first law of nature.

We may protest to our heart's content with reference to these practices; but if the nation engaged in them is being pressed sufficiently hard the practices will be continued regardless of previously accepted rules of international law. That this has been the practice in war for all time will be conceded by students of the history of wars.

Humanitarian rules should be observed as far as possible, and we are entirely right in urging with all of our persuasive force their observance as far as possible; but necessity, which knows no law, supersedes such rules in time of war.

All of the above refers to the conduct of the nations at war in reference to the method of conducting their warfare among themselves. We may protest against what we consider brutal, inhuman and illegal methods and acts of belligerents in the conduct of their war, but that is as far as we may go. The method of conducting their warfare among themselves, improper though it may be, can form no basis for breaking off diplomatic relations or declaring war on our part against any of the nations at war. When we have put ourselves on record as to what we believe should be a proper method under the rules of international law and with due regard to the rights of humanity, we have done all that is required or that can be expected of us.

When we consider our rights as neutrals, however, an entirely different situation is presented. We have a right to demand that vessels under our register and flag, not bearing contraband, shall not be interfered with, even though bound to the port of a belligerent nation, unless that port is actually under blockade, and any interference with our vessels under those circumstances is such a violation of our rights as neutrals as to justify the breaking off of diplomatic relations, or even a declaration of war, unless the damage and offence is satisfactorily explained and adjusted.

Neither the Lusitania nor the Orduna cases present such a question. These were both British vessels. The case of the Gulfight and one other do come under this head, and there are several cases which are on the border line, the case of the William P. Frye being one of them. In the latter case a neutral vessel was destroyed, but her cargo was contraband under the declaration already made by Great Britain. The right of Germany to destroy this cargo is unquestionable. The right to destroy the American vessel carrying the cargo depends upon the conditions.

BRYAN'S INSINCERITY

Still Chief Obstacle to an Understanding with Germany.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: That the words and actions of Mr. Bryan have been and still are the chief obstacle to a close and wise rapprochement between the United States and Germany I profoundly believe. For Germany will not and cannot believe in the sincerity of our State Department notes until they are supported by real action. The mere fact that two of the notes bore the signature "Bryan" stamped them with insincerity. And this impression was heightened by his faithless (if not technically treasonable), private paltering with the Austrian Ambassador, and confirmed by his base appeals to "German Americans" and others opposed to the policies of the government.

Permit me to say that it seems to me that our President and the Secretary of State are in a very real and very serious way to free their skirts from any of the stains which may have been derived by long and close association with the most shameless and dangerous man in America.

For those skirts are stained; and will be so seen by all Germany until she is sure that the trouble maker has been explicitly and severely condemned and disowned by the administration he sought and still seeks to defeat and disgrace in letters of mine type and in the headlines of the New York Tribune of May 14 and June 14—I ventured the suggestions that I still deem to be wise and needful.

Without repeating them now, let me say that I feel that the first thing and the easiest to do to convince the German forces of the sincerity of the President is to call a special session of the Congress for advice, appropriations and whatever legislative action may be needful.

While Germany has several times given cause for belligerent, I would not hastily deem war. There are many other steps equally effective without the horrors of war. Nor, if Congress were called, need we at once recall Gerard and send back Bernstorff.

So long as Germany is impressed by the clamor and misrepresentations of Bryan, so long as she feels that he divides with the President the consensus of public feeling, so long will it be believed by the Teutonic forces that the United States will continue to exercise in dialectics and take no virile action in the habits of a struggling artist, met by a more powerful and more official characterisation of the words and actions of Bryan.

2. The Congress in special session. These two "actions" are the simplest and least harmful ways of demonstrating the manly and patriotic sincerity of the administration.

JOSEPH CULBERTSON CLAYTON. Brooklyn, July 19, 1915.

Should Not Employ Brimstone.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In your issue of yesterday, after referring to the great crowd at Tent Evangel, this city, you go on to state that "many noted evangelists will wave fire and brimstone over the heads of the congregation during the rest of the summer."

This expression is very unreasonable, literally, metaphorically. 1. The tent for religious services is adopted primarily for the coolness that is expected to pervade its precincts. 2. It is not the province of true evangelists to use such methods. If they of today are at all of the same type as Bunyan evangelists their sole purpose should be to point the way to "escape from the wrath to come."

For confirmation of the fact that impending judgment is due those who do not heed the verses found in Acts 19, 20 and Psalms xi, 6 abundantly testify. But all this is beyond the sphere of the evangelist.

New York, July 20, 1915. J. A. M.

circumstances of the capturing vessel.

President Wilson in his first note to Germany after the Lusitania disaster demanded by clear inference that Germany should cease her submarine warfare. The second American note was more nearly in line with the principles above outlined.

The newspapers which are contending that the administration at Washington should reassess the attitude of dictating to any of the nations at war the manner in which they shall conduct their operations